

1 SEYFARTH SHAW LLP  
2 Robert B. Milligan (SBN 217348)  
*rmilligan@seyfarth.com*  
3 D. Joshua Salinas (SBN 282065)  
*jsalinas@seyfarth.com*  
4 2029 Century Park East, Suite 3500  
5 Los Angeles, California 90067-3021  
Telephone: (310) 277-7200  
Facsimile: (310) 201-5219

6 SEYFARTH SHAW LLP  
7 Michael D. Wexler (*pro hac vice* app. to be filed)  
8 Andrew C. Boutros (*pro hac vice* app. to be filed)  
9 233 South Wacker Drive, Suite 8000  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: (312) 460-5000  
Facsimile: (312) 460-7000

10 Attorneys for Defendant  
FUTUREWEI TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION**

16 YIREN HUANG, an individual, and CNEX  
Labs, Inc., Delaware corporation,

**Plaintiff.**

19 v.  
20 FUTUREWEI TECHNOLOGIES, INC., a  
Texas corporation; and DOES 1 through 10

**Defendant.**

Case No. 5:18-cv-00534-BLF

**DEFENDANT'S NOTICE OF MOTION  
AND MOTION TO DISMISS OR, IN  
THE ALTERNATIVE, TO TRANSFER,  
OR TO STAY**

(Santa Clara County Superior Court Case  
No. 17CV321153)

Date: April 5, 2018  
Time: 9:00 a.m.  
Courtroom: 3 - 5th Floor

Complaint Filed: Dec. 28, 2017

1                   **TO PLAINTIFFS AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

2                   **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that on April 5, 2018, at 9:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as counsel may  
 3 be heard in Courtroom 3 - 5th Floor, of the above-entitled Court, located at 280 South 1st Street, San Jose,  
 4 California 95113, Defendant Futurewei Technologies, Inc. (“Futurewei” or “Defendant”) will move and  
 5 hereby does move to dismiss Plaintiffs Yiren Huang (“Huang”) and CNEX Labs, Inc.’s (“CNEX”)  
 6 (collectively “Plaintiffs”) Complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a). Should this Court decide not to dismiss  
 7 Plaintiffs’ Complaint, Futurewei alternatively requests that this action be transferred to the United States  
 8 District Court for the Eastern District of Texas.

9                   Futurewei moves this Court to enforce the mandatory Texas forum selection clause contained in the  
 10 employment agreement on which Plaintiffs seek relief, and to dismiss this action or transfer it to the  
 11 appropriate venue, Eastern District of Texas. Such forum selection clauses are *prima facie* valid, and courts  
 12 routinely enforce them to dismiss or transfer actions brought by former employees seeking declaratory relief  
 13 on employment agreements containing such clauses. *Atlantic Marine Const. Co., Inc. v. U.S. Dist. Court for*  
 14 *W. Dist. of Texas*, 134 S. Ct. 568, 579 (2013) (“enforcement of valid forum-selection clauses, bargained for  
 15 by the parties, protects their legitimate expectations and furthers vital interests of the justice system … a  
 16 valid forum-selection clause [should be] given controlling weight in all but the most exceptional cases.”).

17                   Moreover, courts routinely enforce forum selection clauses against non-signatories, such as Huang’s  
 18 current employer CNEX (which he also co-founded), who are closely related to the contractual relationship.  
 19 *See Manetti-Farrow, Inc. v. Gucci America, Inc.*, 858 F.2d 509, 514 (9th Cir. 1988); *Meras Engineering,*  
 20 *Inc. v. CH20, Inc.*, No. C-11-0389 EMC, 2013 WL 146341, \*13 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 14, 2013) (enforcing  
 21 employment agreement’s Washington forum selection clause against former employees and their non-  
 22 signatory new employer who sought to invalidate an employment agreement with the former employer).

23                   Plaintiffs cannot demonstrate any legally justifiable basis to avoid dismissal or transfer.  
 24 Accordingly, this Court should reject Plaintiffs’ attempt to clothe themselves with California’s alleged  
 25 public policies to analytically leapfrog the mandatory forum selection clause. California federal courts have  
 26 repeatedly held that courts need not and should not address purported public policy concerns in a choice of  
 27 law analysis where a valid forum selection clause exists, even in cases involving alleged violations of

1 California Business and Professions Code section 16600.

2 In the final alternative, Futurewei moves for an order staying the instant action until the completion  
3 of the action in the parties' parallel, pending action in Eastern District of Texas, in order to conserve judicial  
4 resources, minimize duplicative litigation, and avoid the risk that inconsistent obligations will be imposed  
5 on the parties. *See Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd. et al. v. Huang et al.*, No. 4:17-cv-00893 (E.D. Tex., filed  
6 Dec. 28, 2017).

7 This motion is based on this Notice of Motion, the Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the  
8 Declarations of Paul C. Hashim and D. Joshua Salinas, the Request for Judicial Notice, and any other papers  
9 on file herein, and upon such other and further oral and written information as may be presented at or before  
10 the hearing on this motion.

11 DATED: January 31, 2018

SEYFARTH SHAW LLP

13 By: /s/ Robert B. Milligan

14 Robert B. Milligan

15 D. Joshua Salinas

Attorneys for Defendant FUTUREWEI,  
TECHNOLOGIES, INC.